



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE NOMENCLATURE AND TEACHING OF ANTHROPOLOGY.¹

BY DANIEL G. BRINTON, M. D., LL. D.

Although it was long since urged by Whewell, in his *History of the Inductive Sciences*, and is now recognized by all, that a definition of a term in science is merely a condensed expression of our present knowledge regarding it, and not a final statement, it is nevertheless of the utmost importance, both to the investigator and the teacher, to adopt a well-defined nomenclature for his specialty.

This is a particularly pressing need in Anthropology, a comparatively novel branch of study and one which is rapidly progressing.

As in all similar cases, the effort should be made to establish as far as possible a series of international terms which will be practically the same in English, French, German, and Italian. This is not difficult where the words are drawn from Greek or Latin roots. In framing or adopting such, or in selecting scientific terms from one's own language, certain definite rules should be observed to insure clearness and aid in promoting uniformity. It is believed that the following simple directions are so obviously proper that they will be accepted without hesitation as regulative:

RULES.

1. No new term should be coined when there already exists one in the literature of the science which conveys the meaning.
2. A term should not be adopted which exists already in the language with a different signification.
3. A term should be employed in the science in one sense only.
4. A term employed in a recognized sense in the French and German literature of the science should be adopted in the same sense in the United States.
5. A single term for a single idea should usually be preferred to a compound term (noun and adjective or double noun).

¹ Abstract of an address delivered before the Anthropological Society of Washington, April 5, 1892.

It requires but a glance at the current literature of Anthropology to see how little regard is paid even to such self-evident principles as are set forth in these rules.

The word "Anthropology" itself is an illustration. In France it is employed in two significations; the one general, as meaning the whole Science of Man; the other narrower, confined to the study of man as a species of animal only. The former is referred to as "general anthropology," the latter as "special anthropology." This distinction is that carried out by Dr. Paul Topinard in his latest work, *L'homme dans la Nature* (Paris, 1891). Only two years ago he projected a scheme which still further confined the term. It was as follows:

THE SCIENCE OF MAN. (Topinard.)

From the animal side: Anthropology. { General.
From the mental side: Psychology. { Special.
From the social side: Ethnography.

More recently Dr. Topinard has dropped Psychology as a leading heading, and has ranged it as a subordinate department under special anthropology, where it undoubtedly belongs.

This brings his classification quite to the same as that adopted a number of years ago by Friederich Müller, in his *Allgemeine Ethnographie*. He defines Anthropology as the science of man as a *Naturindividuum*, Ethnography as the science of man as a *Volksindividuum*. Yet neither in Germany, France, or elsewhere have the terms "anthropology," "anthropological," when applied to societies or journals, any such narrow signification. Unquestionably the term should be employed, and exclusively employed, in its widest sense only. The proper term for physical anthropology is *Somatology*, a word long familiar in medical dictionaries as embracing the study of the human body, and for years authorized in this sense by the Anthropological Society of Washington.

Still worse confusion has arisen concerning the distinction between Ethnology and Ethnography. Chavannes, in 1787, was the first to propose the term *Ethnology* to express "l'histoire des progrès des peuples vers la civilisation." This is very nearly its true scientific sense; and we owe it to the illiteracy of the French Société d'Ethnologie in 1839 that they assigned to it what Topinard calls "la définition si regrettable" —, "l'ethnologie est l'étude des races humaines."

It has required nearly fifty years to recover from this confusion of terms, and it is still visible in many French and English books. The Germans, however, have placed the two branches of the science in their proper relations. Thus Ratzel writes in his recent comprehensive work, "The business of *Ethnography* is the descriptive study of peoples, the depicting of the different culture-relations of men in the widest sense; the business of *Ethnology* is the investigative study of peoples, the examination of the causes of their differences. *Ethnography* is the geographic and external method of presenting the condition of a given people; *Ethnology* is a historical examination and presentation of its development."

To the same effect Professor Gerland, of Strasburg, writes: "Ethnography describes the customs, laws, and usages of nations; *Ethnology* seeks to set forth the conditions which gave rise to these traits, and the influence they have exerted on the destiny of the people. While *Ethnography* is confined to a description of facts, *Ethnology* undertakes to explain by what physical conditions, social relations, and forms of culture these facts came about."

The distinction here drawn by these able writers is so clear and so desirable in the study of the science that there can no longer be an excuse for confounding the two terms.

The general scheme which I propose for the nomenclature and classification of the anthropological sciences is as follows:

ANTHROPOLOGY.

I. *Somatology*: Physical and Experimental Anthropology.

- a. Internal somatology—embracing osteology, craniology, myology, and splanchnology.
- b. External somatology—embracing anthropometry, color, hair, canons of proportion, etc.
- c. Psychology—experimental and practical.
- d. Developmental and comparative somatology—including embryology, teratology, human biology, medical geography, vital statistics, etc.

II. *Ethnology*: Historic and Analytic Anthropology.

- a. Definitions and methods—stages of culture, ethnic psychology, etc.
- b. Sociology—governments, marriage relations, laws, institutions.
- c. Technology—embracing the development of the utilitarian and the fine arts.

- d. Science of religion—primitive religions, mythology, symbolism, religious arts, teachers and doctrines, special religions.
- e. Linguistics—gesture and sign language, spoken and written language.
- f. Folk-lore.

III. *Ethnography*: Geographic and Descriptive Anthropology.

- a. General ethnography.
- b. Special ethnography—monographs, etc.

IV. *Archeology*: Prehistoric and Reconstructive Anthropology.

- a. General archeology—geology of the epoch of man, prehistoric botany and zoology, ages of stone, bronze, and iron.
- b. Special archeology—description of special periods and nations.

An examination of this scheme will, I am persuaded, prove it to be one comprehending all the various departments of the science, arranged progressively in such a manner that they can be presented to the student in the readiest shape for facile acquisition.

Thus, Somatology is purely objective and physical. Even the psychology which it embraces is of that strictly inductive and experimental character which renders it a concrete and empirical branch. Ethnology, the study of the *development* of arts and institutions, of governments, religions, and languages, is an essentially necessary preparation for the comprehension of Ethnography, which is a picture of the present actual condition of peoples in these respects. Archeology naturally falls into the last place, as supplying that which neither the records of history nor present observation furnishes.

Of course, the gradual advance of this broad science will in time require more or less modifications in this or any scheme; but the above, which is the result of several years of practical instruction, as well as of a careful collation of authorities, is offered as appropriate to the present meaning and scope of Anthropology.

At the conclusion of the above address Major J. W. Powell made the following remarks:

The usefulness, and even the possibility, of language depends upon convention. Those who use a language as a common medium of communication must by some means arrive at a common usage

of words, so that the concepts which they have shall be represented by symbols common to all and understood by all. The assignment of linguistic symbols to concepts is not arranged by legislation or agreement formulated in deliberative bodies, but is slowly fixed by process of best usage, which is gradually developed. A word is coined to express a new concept, and the word thus coined may be permanently attached to the concept ; but concepts themselves grow, and as they grow the sematic content of the corresponding word grows, or, in other cases, new words are used. Some attempts have been made in scientific circles to fix words permanently to definite concepts, but such attempts have, in the main, been futile. On the other hand, rules of nomenclature have been adopted, and sometimes with success. It seems impossible to establish the meaning of words by legislation. On the other hand, it seems possible at times to provide for growing sciences a system of rules by which great confusion in nomenclature is avoided. The rule of priority established by biologists is one of these. The best terms may not thus be secured, but generally-accepted terms are used ; and this is the really important end to be accomplished. In the science which we cultivate in this Society there has been, up to the present time, a certain vagueness in the classification of its concepts and concomitant vagueness in the terms used. But classifications are clearing up and the nomenclature is becoming more clearly defined ; the proceedings of this Society, the papers read, the discussions that have ensued thereon, and the publishing of the materials have all conspired to aid in bringing cosmos out of chaos. Doctor Brinton, the speaker of the evening, has clearly set forth the importance of scientific classification and the value of a generally-accepted nomenclature. With his suggestion that the scientific bodies legislate on this subject and attempt to formulate a classification for the subject-matter of anthropology, and to establish a nomenclature, I cannot agree. I think it will be found that the only method by which these matters can be settled is by submitting to the law of the survival of the fittest ; but perhaps there are some departments of anthropology where rules of nomenclature can be adopted to advantage. For example, I think that it would be possible to borrow from the biologists the rule of priority in the naming of linguistic families. Systematic philology, or the grouping of languages into families or stocks, is progressing rapidly, and the known families are multiplying, and much confusion exists by reason of the multiplicity of names

used severally for many of these families. In a late publication which I have made on the classification of the North American linguistic stocks, I have adopted this rule of priority, and, so far as the facts were presented to me, have observed it rigidly, but have gone no farther back in the study of the North American languages than to include the work of Gallatin, who was the first to adopt scientific principles in this department of research. There are other rules which can be adopted to advantage, but I shall not discuss them now.

I propose to put on the blackboard my scheme of classification and nomenclature of the science of anthropology. In doing so it must be distinctly understood that I hold it only tentatively; that I doubt not but that it will be greatly modified and improved in the future, and, further, I shall improve it myself, if possible, and I hold myself ready at all times to change even my fundamental concept of the science as investigation progresses and new facts, principles, and laws are established. (The following is an outline of the scheme and of the remarks made thereon.)

The term Anthropology was first used to designate a body of theological doctrines, and was subsequently borrowed by scientific men. In the new sense it was used to designate the science of man as an animal. At that time efforts were made to classify men, as species or races or distinct groups, by animal characteristics, as by the color of the skin, the structure of the hair, the conformation of the skull, etc. These attempts did not meet with success; no classification was established which could be considered as satisfactory. Types or widely varying varieties were discovered, but they so merged into one another that planes of demarkation were lost. Then an attempt was made to extend the basis of classification to language, arts, religions, etc., but still no classification resulted which all or even any large body of men were willing to accept. It was in this manner that a larger and larger body of facts, principles and laws were brought into the science which was called Anthropology, until in late years Anthropology has been used as a term to designate the whole science of man—man as an animal, man as a thinking being, and man as an actor in economic arts, institutions, languages, literature, fine arts, religions and opinions. It is in this broad sense that I use the term Anthropology.

Anthropology is the science of man. As the term is used by me, this science is divided into three fundamental departments: The

first is the biology of man, which is called *Somatology* in the constitution of this Society. The term *Somatology* originally had a very different meaning, as the science of body at large ; then it had various restricted meanings ; but in late years the term is used more and more as equivalent to the biology of man. *Somatology* deals with man in so far as he is considered an animal in the origin and development of the human race. It also deals with the development of the individual from the germ to the adult stage. It includes anatomy and physiology, the origin and nature of disease, and the methods of averting premature death, etc.

The second science of Anthropology is *Psychology*, or the science of mind, sometimes called the science of the soul, which includes, besides the general subject of psychology, the special sciences of psycho-physics, physiological psychology, and various other departments of the subject, and derives advantage from comparative psychology, or the study of the minds of the lower animals.

The third department of Anthropology is *Ethnology*. The term *Ethnology* has been used in various senses. At first it was used to designate the science by which men were studied as constituent members of different nations and tribes ; then it was used as synonymous with Anthropology when this term was made to include only the classification of mankind by biotic characteristics. It has sometimes been used in the broad sense in which I have defined Anthropology ; but of late years a usage has sprung up broader than the one and narrower than the other, by which the term is applied to the last of the three great departments of Anthropology. In this sense *Ethnology* is synonymous with a term which I have used for many years, namely, the *Humanities*. These are as follows :

First. *Technology*, or the science of the industrial arts, the decorative arts, and the arts of amusement.

Second. *Philology*, sometimes called *Glottology*, sometimes *Linguistics* ; it is the science of languages.

Third. *Sociology*, or the science of institutions. This is the science of organized society. In organization I recognize three methods, namely : (1) by division of labor ; (2) by confederation, or the union of bodies of men into societies for governmental and other purposes ; and (3) by regulation, or the enforcement of laws and maxims of conduct. By these methods of social organization men are socially related, and three fundamental sciences spring therefrom, namely : (a) *Economics*, or political economy ; (b) *Civics*, or

the science of government ; and (*c*) *Ethics*, or the science of moral conduct.

Fourth. The fine arts, or *Esthetology*. How the fine arts should be classified and what arts are in fact included in the fine arts are matters about which usage is greatly varied. Perhaps the most common usage includes architecture, sculpture, painting, music, and literature, though many authorities would include only poetry instead of literature at large. My own custom has been to exclude architecture, which I consider to be one of the industrial arts, but to include sculpture, painting, music, romance, drama, and poetry.

Fifth. We now come to a great field of research relating to man, in which there has been no very consistent attempt at classification, but which I have heretofore included in the science of opinions. It includes literature, except so far as literature is considered as romance, drama, and poetry—that is, it embraces that literature which is a record of the opinions of mankind. It is thus the science of lore. It records the opinions of people in all times and in all lands, and the investigator compares them for the purpose of discovering the evolution of opinion or the development of concepts. It considers popular opinion and opinions of the learned on all subjects on which the mind dwells. It deals with truth and error alike, so far as they have been accepted as the opinions of men ; it includes science on the one hand and mythology on the other. For the science of opinions I propose the name *Sophiology*.

Now, Mythology is a part of Sophiology, as those terms are here used, and mythology can in a general way be divided into *Cult-lore* and *Folk-lore*. Cult-lore refers to the myths which the people entertain as a living body of opinions and which enter into their religious culture and constitute to a greater or less extent a sanction for their institutions, and, finally, which constitute for them an explanation in whole or in part of the phenomena of the universe. Folk-lore is a faded cult-lore, no longer held sacred and no longer held as a living philosophy of the universe, but still believed by the more ignorant and told by all as curious tales of ghosts, fairies, and various other mythic personages, and embracing a large body of opinions about thaumaturgy, believed by some and not believed by others, but perhaps vaguely believed by many. Natural religion, then, so far as it pertains to opinions, is included in Sophiology.

I have reserved the term *Natural Religion* for a sixth department, and make it nearly synonymous with worship, or the arts of religion, or the methods by which the gods of natural religion or natural the-

ology are influenced for good or evil by the acts of mankind. Theology proper, or revealed religion, is excluded from Ethnology, and forms a department by itself, but may be included in Philosophy.

The classification which I have thus set forth does not exist perhaps in its entirety, but I think that scientific men are gradually formulating the materials of Anthropology somewhat as here set forth.

The system of classification as set forth is one which in its chief characteristics I have used for several years, and some slight modifications have been suggested to me from time to time in the subject-matter of ethnology. I am inclined at the present time to adopt the following classification in the department of ethnology: (1) Technology or Arts, including industrial or economic arts, decorative arts, and the arts of amusement, as in the scheme previously presented. (2) Sociology or Institutions, divided into economics, civics, and ethics, as before. (3) Philology, or the science of linguistics, as before. (4) Literature, including the general subject of literature, together with romance, drama, and poetry. (5) Esthetology or Esthetics, including only sculpture, painting, and music. (6) Natural Religion. (7) Sophiology, or the science of opinions—that is, the history of opinions as exhibited in literature and as expressed in language and existing in corresponding concepts, which are of three classes—mythologic, metaphysic, and scientific. This seventh department, then, is the science of the evolution of thought as exhibited in the lore of mankind in all times and in all lands. It is the history and explanation of opinions which are mythologic, metaphysic, and scientific. This seems to me to be a classification and a nomenclature which can be adopted at the present stage of the science with advantage.

I use the term Ethnography to designate any description of ethnologic material. Ethnography bears the same relation to Ethnology that geography does to geology. Geography is a description of facts relating to the features of the earth. Geology is the whole science of the earth and includes Geography. Archeology is not a distinct science, but refers only to some of the methods by which the facts of Ethnology are obtained. We are able to learn something of tribes and nations as they existed anterior to their appearance in recorded history from the vestiges they have left of their works of art, found in ruins, buried in cemeteries, and scattered over the face of the earth, and investigations of this character fall under the head of Archeology as integral parts of Technology and Esthetology.

KIOWA NAME CHANGES.—In civilization names are mere labels, and Mr. Smith might be Brown, Jones, or Robinson, as far as concerns his health or happiness. Among Indians, however, the name is as much a part of the owner's entity as his hand or his stomach, and misfortune follows the abuse of one as quickly as of the other. We find among our wild tribes a general unwillingness to speak the name of the dead, as tending in some way to disturb the rest of the departed. The Kiowas carry this to such an extreme as to drop from the language for a time the leading word of the dead man's name. Thus, for instance, if a man named "White Bear" should die, the word for *bear* is no longer pronounced, but instead is substituted a new word which, from its etymology, is understood to convey the same meaning. The former word must not again be spoken for a period of about ten years, when the tabu is lifted; but it frequently happens that the new word has become so firmly fixed in the meantime as to supersede the former term entirely. In collecting linguistic material from old men of the tribe I have sometimes found as many as three names for the same thing, each in turn having been used as another became obsolete on account of the death tabu. Some of these substitutions display considerable ingenuity. Thus, a man named "Hard Rock" or "Red Rock," or something of the kind, having died, the word *tso*, "rock," was dropped and *dodalpa*, literally "hammer," was substituted, the Indian hammer being simply a stone fastened to a handle. Another man named "The Six" died, and instead of *Six* they now say *Little Seven*. A somewhat similar custom is found among the Comanches and also among the Eskimo.

JAMES MOONEY.

LAKE DWELLINGS IN IRELAND.—Probably the first records of lake dwellings were made in Ireland, where this method of habitation has been in existence from remote periods to comparatively recent times. There is documentary evidence that some of the Irish crannogs were in existence and occupied in the time of Elizabeth. They were usually approached in canoes, and were not connected with the shore by a gangway. In Scotland a large number of similar structures have been discovered. Dr. Robert Monro has ventured an opinion that the original British Celts, who were probably the builders of the lake dwellings, were an offshoot of the founders of the Swiss lake dwellings, who emigrated to Britain and spread northwards and westwards over Scotland and Ireland.—J. W. Davis in *Natural Science*, Vol. I, No. 1, London, Mar., 1892.